

INDIVIDUAL REVIEW RUBRIC

2015 Social Innovation Fund Grant Competition

Rating Descriptions

Grants will be awarded on a competitive basis. Reviewers will assess the application based on the Selection Criteria published in the 2015 Social Innovation Fund (SIF) Notice of Federal Funding Availability (*Notice*).

The following are description for the rating scale to be used while assessing the SIF applications. Apply the rating you believe **best describes** how the application addresses the Selection Criteria.

Excellent

A high-quality, detailed response that addresses all aspects of the Selection Criteria and exceeds some. Strengths are substantial and solid. No weaknesses are identified, or any weakness has a minimal effect on the overall quality of the response. A high confidence that the proposed activities will achieve and exceed the anticipated results.

Good

A quality response that addresses most or all aspects of the Selection Criteria. Strengths are substantial, but do not exceed what is required. Weaknesses are low in quantity and minimal in effect on the overall quality of the response. Proposed activities should achieve the anticipated results.

Fair

Response addresses some to most aspects of the Selection Criteria, but makes assumptions and leaves aspects unexplained. Strengths are not significant, and some weaknesses affect the overall quality of the response, demonstrating room for improvement. It is unclear how the proposed activities will achieve all of the anticipated results.

Inadequate

A low-quality or very weak response that does not address most of the Selection Criteria. Overall response is lacking or inadequate making assumptions in key elements. Weaknesses relating to vague or inaccurate detail are numerous or significantly outweigh the strengths. There is low to zero confidence that the proposed activities will achieve the anticipated results.

Rating Values

Based upon your assessment of which rating description fits best, you will assign the following points (Note: the points are pre-weighted to reflect the weights assigned by the CNCS in the *Notice*).

	Excellent	Good	Fair	Inadequate
PROGRAM DESIGN (70%)				
a. Rationale and Approach	10	8	6	4
b. Proposal for Subrecipient Selection	15	12	9	6
c. Proposal for Evaluation	30	24	18	12
d. Proposal for Growing Subrecipient Impact	15	12	9	6
ORGANIZATIONAL CAPABILITY (15%)				
a. Organizational Background and Staff Capacity	5	4	3	2
b. Subrecipient Support, Monitoring and Oversight	5	4	3	2
c. Strategy for Sustainability	5	4	3	2
COST EFFECTIVENESS AND BUDGET ADEQUACY (15%)				
a. Budget Justification	15	12	9	6
b. Capacity to Raise Match				
Totals	100	80	60	40

Total possible Program Review Points: 70 points

Total possible Evaluation Review Points: 30 points